

RH
WL
G1354

COMMUNISM IS TREASON!

FIGHT IT WITH...



Common Sense®

LEADER IN THE NATION'S FIGHT AGAINST COMMUNISM

® Trade-mark registered 1948 United States Patent Office

Issue No. 446 (20th Year) March 1, 1965

Second Class Postage Paid at Union, New Jersey, U.S.A.

FIVE CENTS

Conde McGinley
1890 • FOUNDER • 1963

10447
1965

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

SUGAR-COATED POISON POLLUTES AMERICAN BLOOD STREAM

By J. Johnston McCauley

For centuries tyrants have boasted that if they could control the education of a country's youth, that country would become forever theirs within the space of a couple of generations. If the directors of an anti-freedom ideology can, without opposition or contradiction, pour their doctrine into the minds of the youngsters without permitting them to learn any other doctrine, they will develop generations of Zealots dedicated to their beliefs. These facts must be considered in connection with proposals for Federal aid to education.

We have been told there is no foundation for the fear that "Federal money means government control," but that is questionable. Does anybody pretend that the Federal government exercises no effort to control the Federal highway program or what the farmers may do under the Federal farm program?

To understand some of the background of the Federal Aid to Education program, we need to look back at some recent history. In November, 1960, the 11th Session of the General Conference of UNESCO, meeting in Paris, France, prepared a document entitled "Draft Convention Against Discrimination in Education." The idea was to submit this document to all members of the Socialistic United Nations for ratification as a treaty, binding the ratifying nations to reorganize and direct their educational institutions in compliance with the terms of the treaty. Simultaneously, while this was transpiring the Committee on Mission and Organization of the United States Office of Education was preparing a report on the role the committee thought the Federal government should play in educational matters in the future. The report eventually was issued in the form of a 55-page booklet called, "A Federal Education Agency for the Future." With the publication of this document, the aims and purposes of the Socialistic planners became clearer. For the first time it was possible to see that the UNESCO document, the Office of Education Report, and the plan for Federal aid to education were all part and parcel of a program which, if carried out in full, would internationalize our entire educational system.

The report of the Office of Education called, first of all, for a massive Federal aid program which would result in the elimination of state, local and private financing of schools and colleges and thus transfer to the Federal government the total responsibility for education. Secondly, the report insisted that this tremendous and vital responsibility be placed within the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. It stipulated that the agency within the department exercising the responsibility would be answerable neither to the Congress nor to the American people, but would simply obtain its annual appropriations from Congress on

"Hop Right Into These, Sonny!"



The Times-Picayune, New Orleans States

a blank check basis so it could construct and direct the kind of American educational system its members wanted. However, what the report did specify was that this agency within the Health, Education and Welfare would be answerable to the socialistic United Nations, that it would make regular reports to, and work under the supervision of UNESCO. This, obviously, would enable the Socialists, who dictate so many of UNESCO's policies, to get a stranglehold on our entire educational system.

The nature of this report by the U. S. Office of Education was stated explicitly by a group of five members of the Committee on Education of the House of Representatives:

"We should never permit the American educational system to become a vehicle for experimentation by educational ideologies. A careful analysis of the writings of influential spokesmen in the educational field, indicates a desire on the part of many of these individuals to utilize the educational system as a means of transforming the economic and social outlook of the United States . . . Anyone who doubts that the Federal aid to education bills would mean eventual Federal control of education should carefully read and analyze what the Office of Education is planning for tomorrow's schools."

In elaborating on the report by the Office of Education, it should be added that this report requests that the Office of Education become an agency of the Federal government at the equivalent of Cabinet level. The writers plan that this new agency's role would be one of leadership, national policy-making, national-planning, and a broadening of Federal interest in the course of study taught in our schools.

The report suggests that the proposed new agency would play a vital role in reforming the goals of our educational system and of our society. No wonder the dissenting members of the House Education committee said, "In our opinion, this is a clear attempt to take command and control of the American educational system."

The Office of Education, in its report, boldly anticipates what it calls "multiple relationships with ministries of education abroad and international organizations such as UNESCO." Briefly, the effect of this combination of proposals would be the destruction of the community educational systems in this country and, finally, the destruction of any American educational system. The plan is first to remove education from local control and then to build a Socialized system which would fall under the supervision of the internationalists who dominate the activities of UNESCO.

Of course, the planners aim to take us along this road so deceitfully that we will not know where we are going. They say now that, even though they seek Federal aid not only for school construction but also for teachers' salaries, they have not thought of Federal control. They merely want, they emphasize, to "improve educational quality." The moment you start discussing quality it is obvious that someone must set the standards. If the Federal government puts up the money, will not the Federal planners insist on setting the standards? Of course they will. And then the question must arise: "Are these Federal planners qualified to decree the quality of the education offered our young people?" Over the years, we know, many of them have been associated with the so-called "progressive" theory of education, which many schools and communities have long since decided was leaning backward instead of forward.

We are frequently asked to forget our fear of Federal control; we are assured that such fears are unfounded, but an examination of the proposals that have been made, leads to the conviction that these fears simply cannot be brushed aside as baseless. There can be no Federal aid without Federal control following along, and, as has become obvious, the implications of Federal aid runs much deeper and in more sinister channels than we have been asked to believe. The advocates of Federal aid to education are working hand-in-glove with the advocates of international control of education.

Let us not overlook the fact that every tyrant and despot in history has sought to perpetuate his dictatorship by dominating and controlling the education of the youngsters. World Communism knows this technique quite well, and the conspirators have used it from the beginning of their conspiracy. The Federal Aid to Education program, plus the UNESCO treaty, could furnish them the apparatus with which to take over our educational system quietly and completely.

REGISTER COMMUNISTS NOT FIREARMS